



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,475	04/13/2001	Paul L. Mullen	GEMS8081.070	7317
27061 7590 01/29/2008 ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS) 136 S WISCONSIN ST PORT WASHINGTON, WI 53074			EXAMINER LANEAU, RONALD	
			ART UNIT 3714	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/29/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

info@zpspatents.com  
rlt@zpspatents.com  
klb@zpspatents.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/681,475  
Filing Date: April 13, 2001  
Appellant(s): MULLEN ET AL.

**MAILED**  
**JAN 25 2008**  
**GROUP 3700**

Timothy J. Ziolkowski  
Kevin R. Rosin

For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 10/15/07 appealing from the Office action  
mailed 03/07/07.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,182,249	WOOKEY	1-2001
6,317,639	HANSEN	11-2001

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16-19 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wookey et al (US 6,182,249 B1).

Wookey discloses a system and method for remotely managing communication of electronic data between a diagnostic service center and a plurality of machines generally remote relative to each other (see claim 12) including the steps of: remotely collecting condition data representative of a device status (col. 12, lines 14-26); storing the condition data on a database a centralized facility (fig. 1, 109; storing data in a centralized diagnostic database); reviewing the condition data to identify at least the device diagnostic data and the device reminder data (col. 1, lines 28-53; this is typical for an operator of the system or a supervisor to review the diagnostics); and separately displaying and identifying on a graphical user interface (GUI) the device diagnostic data and the device reminder data (col. 16, lines 41-58; alerting of the schedule repair). Wookey further discloses that the statistic log may be configured so that the graphical user interface allows for user-friendly manipulation of data and for example generation of reports

may be implemented in graphical and/or tabular format with electronic editing, copying, cutting and pasting options (table 1 seen in cols. 4 and 5 allow a user to see the statistics for repair and the reports can have different formats and one would be able to edit, copy, cut and paste and may be distributed weekly, monthly, etc based on the log of diagnostic statistics and the report may be configured to be distributed through the Internet or an intranet via a predetermined Web server). The system of Wookey is inherently capable of being programmed to acquire the condition data and the reminder data via a wireless system seen in figure 1 and also allow operators to monitor downloads in process and/or in queue and identify the type of download as claimed (see fig. 1). Wookey further discloses the steps of storing data processing of components on components of an equipment, said data processing system associates at least one predictive maintenance factor with the corresponding component data, a scheduler schedules maintenance for a maintenance time period for at least one of the components based on the first database (col. 15, line 66 to col. 16, line 15), the second database, the associated predictive maintenance factor, and an elapsed time with respect to an installation date of at least one component, said predictive maintenance factor may be defined by one or more of the following: a longevity estimate, a probability of failure, a financial estimate on maintenance of a component (col. 15, line 66 to col. 16, line 15). The system of Wookey can be used in a medical environment and also uses Internet to access data and monitors the plurality of machines.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,3, 5, 6, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wookey et al (US 6,182,249 B1) in view of Hansen (US 6,317,639 B1).

As per claims 2, 5, 6 and 10, the rejection of claim 1 applies. Wookey does not disclose updating the data but Hansen discloses updating the maintenance file record to reflect the diagnosis, the schedule for service, etc (col. 5, lines 42-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Hansen into the system of Wookey because it would provide ways to track diagnostic data of devices to ensure they are in proper working order.

As per claims 15 and 20, none of the references teaches marketing data, customer-entered data, and messages are consolidated. However, these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the information is consolidated. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ 2d 1031 (Fed Cir 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consolidate marketing

data, customer-entered data, and messages because the type of information being consolidated does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wookey does not disclose "separately displaying and identifying" device diagnostic data and device reminder data for a remote device on a GUI. In response to Applicant's arguments, Wookey discloses in figure 12 a system visualization screen that provides graphical representation of a host state that displays and identifies diagnostic data as claimed (see fig. 12). Applicant further argues about "reminder data" that is based upon some predetermined information. In response to Applicant's arguments, Wookey discloses an alert system that indicated predefined conditions existed in a computer system. Since the condition is preset in the disclosure of Wookey then the alert system of Wookey can be used as a reminder system as claimed. The same reasoning is also applicable to Applicant's arguments with regard to claim 9.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**


No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Application/Control Number:  
09/681,475  
Art Unit: 3714


Page 7

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ronald Laneau

Conferees:

 Robert Pezzuto

  
**JOHN M. HOTALING, II**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

 Andrew Fischer

